

REMARKS

All of the pending claims of the present application have been rejected in view of certain prior art references. In particular, claims 1-2, 4-5, and 15-18 have been rejected as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by U.S. Patent No. 6, 320,563 to Yang et al. The remaining claims have been rejected as being obvious in view of the patent to Yang in combination with the other references, namely, U.S. Patent No. 5,748,277 to Huang et al.; U.S. Patent No. 6, 268,839 to Yang et al.; U.S. Patent No. 6,094,187 to Jones et al.; or U.S. Patent No. 6,133,895 to Huang.

It must be remembered that anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires the presence in a single prior art reference a disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. *Connell v. Sears Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542, 1548, 220 U.S.P.Q. 193, 198 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Thus, for an anticipation rejection to stand, all limitations of the claim must be found in the reference or be fully met by it.

Upon review of the present specification, the Examiner's comments, and the cited references, the Applicants respectfully request entry of amendments to the independent claims for purpose of distinguishing the invention. Claims 1 and 15 now set forth that the method and the display are directed to addressing a bistable cholesteric liquid crystal material having incremental reflectance properties. The method and display further set forth that a predetermined number of pulses are applied to the first plurality of electrodes within a set period of time wherein each pulse applied to the first electrodes has a different drive period within the set period of time. A like number of predetermined pulses are applied to the second plurality of electrodes within the set period of time and each of those pulses applied to the second electrodes also have different drive periods within the set period of time. The display and related drive method continues by setting forth that one of two amplitude values are selectively associated with at least one of the pulses applied to the electrodes to generate a desired incremental reflectance for each of the pixels, wherein the desired incremental reflectance is determined by which one of the amplitude values is associated with which one of the different periods.

Although the '187 patent to Yang generally discloses that a drive scheme controls the voltages, amplitude, frequency and polarity of the drive scheme, there is no express teaching that the drive scheme includes a specific set drive period. Moreover, nothing in Yang teaches or suggests that there can be a predetermined number of pulses within a drive period, that each drive period is different within the set period of time, nor that an amplitude associated with each pulse within the drive period is selected from a number of different amplitude values to obtain an incremental reflectance. Indeed, Yang and all of the other primary references made of record do not teach or suggest, either singly or in combination, that the number of pulses in the drive scheme are in any way related to the number of incremental reflectances obtainable from the drive scheme. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the independent claims are allowable over the art made of record and that all claims depending therefrom are likewise deemed allowable.

It is also submitted that the depending claims are allowable on their own merit. In particular, it is noted that there is no teaching or suggestion in any of the references made of record that a number of predetermined number of pulses correspond to the different number of reflectances provided by the drive scheme. Most of the drive schemes cited rely on applying a certain voltage value during a selection phase to obtain a desired reflectance between a complete focal conic state and a complete planar state. Therefore, it is believed that claim 5 is allowable on its own merit. Likewise, claims 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14 and 18, 19 are nowhere taught or suggested in any of the cited references. Therefore, allowance of those claims is also respectfully requested.

A Request for One-Month Time Extension is attached along with a check in the amount of \$110.00 (large entity). In the event the fee required for the filing of these documents is not enclosed or is deemed insufficient, the Assistant Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks is hereby authorized to withdraw the required funds from Deposit Account No. 18-0987. If a withdrawal is required from Deposit Account No. 18-0987, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests that the Assistant Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks cite Attorney Docket Number KDS.P0001 for billing purposes.

Application No.: 09/780,737
Amendment dated: February 12, 2004
Reply to Office Action of October 28, 2003

Should the Examiner deem a telephone call to be beneficial in resolving any remaining matters or to place the claims in better form for allowance, the same would be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,



Ray L. Weber, Reg. No. 26,519
Andrew B. Morton, Reg. No. 37,400
Renner, Kenner, Greive, Bobak, Taylor & Weber
First National Tower - Fourth Floor
Akron, Ohio 44308-1456
Telephone: (330) 376-1242
Facsimile: (330) 376-9646
E-mail: abmorton@rennerkenner.com

Attorney for Applicant(s)

February 12, 2004